

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1, 3, 14, 15 and 20-25 are now present in the application. Claims 1, 3, 14 and 15 have been amended. Claims 20-25 have been added. Claims 4-13 and 16-19 have been withdrawn and hereby cancelled. Claims 1 and 21 are independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Restriction

The Examiner has acknowledged Applicants' restriction and has made the restriction requirement final to withdraw claims 4-13 and 16-19 from further consideration. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 4-13 and 16-19 have been cancelled.

Priority Under 35 U.S.C. §119

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging Applicants' claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. §119, and receipt of the certified priority document.

Drawings

Applicants thank the Examiner for accepting the formal drawings of the instant application.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3, 14 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Crisp, U.S. Patent No. 6,799,085. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

Without conceding to the propriety of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to clarify the present invention, as the Examiner will note, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite a combination of elements including "[a] regenerative water supply controller of a dish washer...comprising: a memory part storing information of preset hardness values of the washing water and supplying time periods of the regenerative water to the ion exchange resin corresponding to the respective preset hardness values; an input part providing the hardness value of the washing water; and a controlling part retrieving the supplying time period of the regenerative water from the memory part corresponding to the provided hardness value from the input part, and controlling the regenerative water supply part to supply the regenerative water to the ion exchange resin for the supplying time period of the regenerative water retrieved from the memory part."

The Examiner in the outstanding Office Action relied on Crisp alone against claims 1, 3, 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Applicants respectfully disagree. In particular, according to MPEP 2131,

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." (Citation omitted) ... "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." (Citation omitted). (Emphasis added.)

However, Crisp simply discloses an appliance supply distribution, dispensing and use system and method without addressing the claimed feature of controlling a supplying time period of a regenerative water corresponding to a hardness value of a washing water in a dish washer. In fact, Crisp simply discloses the system can dispense one type of washing detergent (from a plurality of different detergents) when different washing cycles are used (see col. 8, lines 49-53) and the user may touch selections 42 to dispense a supply or to cause the appliance to dispense a supply, such as one type of dishwashing soap in a dishwasher (see col. 9, lines 1-6.) However, Crisp nowhere discloses supplying a regenerative water to a dish water for a predetermined time period corresponding to the hardness value of the washing water as recited in original claim 1.

The Examiner seemed to acknowledge that Crisp fails to teach the above claimed features, and therefore stated “controlling the harness level of the water in such a machine is known in the art; hard water is known to clog pipes and to complicate soap and detergent dissolving in water, therefore utilizing the controlled dispensing system of Crisp aids in overcoming common issues formed by hard water” (see Office Action, page 5, lines 20-22; page 6, line 1.) In other words, the Examiner relied on not only Crisp alone, but also teachings not expressly or inherently shown in Crisp. Since Crisp fails to teach each and every recitation of original independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner fails to establish a prima facie case of anticipation against claim 1 and its dependent claims in the outstanding Office Action. However, if the Examiner raises new rejection(s) to claim 1 and its dependent claims in the subsequent Office Action, the subsequent Office Action must be made non-final because the failure to establish a prima facie case in the outstanding Office Action and then finally rejecting claims in the subsequent Office Action would be improper.

In addition, although the Examiner alleged that the hard water is known to clog pipes and to complicate soap and detergent dissolving in water, utilizing the controlled dispensing system of Crisp with a regenerative water supply part will still fail to achieve the present invention. In particular, even if Crisp's system can supply a regenerative water, assuming *arguendo*, Crisp's system still fails to teach controlling the regenerative water supply part to supply the regenerative water for the supplying time period of the regenerative water corresponding to the hardness value. One of the drawbacks the present invention has overcome is to precisely control the amount of the regenerative water corresponding to the hardness level of the washing water (see paragraph 0013.) By simply dispensing the regenerative water without precisely controlling the amount of the regenerative water (e.g., dispensing the regenerative water for a fixed amount every time), the performance of the ion exchange resin may not be effectively restored or the excessive amount of the regenerative water is wasted due to the variance of the water hardness level.

Therefore, even if Crisp's system can supply a regenerative water, assuming *arguendo*, it still fails to teach "a memory part storing information of preset hardness values of the washing water and supplying time periods of the regenerative water to the ion exchange resin corresponding to the respective preset hardness values; an input part providing the hardness value of the washing water; and a controlling part retrieving the supplying time period of the regenerative water from the memory part corresponding to the provided hardness value from the input part, and controlling the regenerative water supply part to supply the regenerative water to the ion exchange resin for the supplying time period of the regenerative water retrieved from the memory part" as recited in amended claim 1.

In addition, claims 3, 14 and 15 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1, and are therefore allowable based on their respective dependence from independent claim 1, which is believed to be allowable.

In view of the above amendments to the claims and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 3, 14 and 15 clearly define the present invention over the reference relied on by the Examiner. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are respectfully requested.

Additional Claims

Additional claims 20-25 have been added for the Examiner's consideration.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of elements as set forth in new independent claim 21 is not disclosed or suggested by the references relied on by the Examiner.

In addition, claims 20 and 22-25 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1 and 21, and are therefore allowable based on their respective dependence from independent claims 1 and 21, which are believed to be allowable.

Favorable consideration and allowance of claims 20-25 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: May 4, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

James T. Eller, Jr.

Registration No.: 39,538

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant